

Pres. Willkie
Sen. Avest
Rep. Branham
Mayor Rhames
Sen. Kennedy
Mrs. C. C. Mitchell
Mrs. C. C. Mitchell
Mrs. Ricketts
Marion Holley
Ston Slawlyn
Original
(77-3)

ADDRESS OF SENATOR STROM THURMOND (D-SC) TO CAMDEN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
CAMDEN, SOUTH CAROLINA, APRIL 3, 1959.

The 86th Congress has now been in session for about three months, and to date/there have been a number of major measures acted on by one or both houses. Committees have been especially busy, and much additional legislation will be acted on in the coming months. I would like to briefly review for you, first, the major legislation that has been acted on, and second, some of the issues which will face the Congress after the recess.

The first issue which faced the Senate/was a major effort by radicals to change the Senate rules/with respect to limitation of debate. I opposed all of the proposed changes, which were designed to enable groups hostile to the South/to pass legislation without full discussion. Although we were able to defeat attempts/to have the existing rules declared inapplicable to the new Senate, and also to limit debate by a majority vote, the rules were changed to allow debate to be ended/by a two-thirds vote of those present and voting. Previously, a two-thirds vote of the membership of the Senate was required to limit debate on any measure/except a motion to proceed to a consideration of adopting new rules, on which debate could not be limited at all under the former rules.

An omnibus housing bill, one small section of which will result in U. S. taxpayers assuming liability/for approximately \$84 billion over the next 40 years, passed the Senate in spite of my strong opposition. The House of Representatives has not yet acted on the housing bill. We cannot afford a wild spending spree for public housing, and even if we could, we do not need this housing. The urban renewal feature of this bill is also bad. It permits the Government to have a free hand in condemning areas, razing them, and then selling these areas at a loss to private contractors. I did succeed in getting a provision stricken from this bill/which would have opened the door for a master plan to hasten the integration of public housing. Although the opposition to this bill in the Senate/was too weak to keep this legislation from passing, there were sufficient votes against the measure to uphold a Presidential veto, if it be necessary.

The Federal Airport Act extension, as passed by the Senate, would give the Federal Aviation Agency \$100 million per year for the next four years/and a special fund of \$63 million/to spend assisting

States and communities in building airports and facilities. Even without the 63 million dollar special fund, this is \$37 million a year more than the present level of spending/for this purpose. It is a great deal more than General Quesada, Chairman of the Federal Aviation Agency, feels ~~that~~ is needed or usable. As a result, I opposed this added extravagance. The bill passed the Senate, but the House of Representatives, which passed the extension on March 19, limited the total authorization to \$297 million, as compared to the \$463 million in the Senate bill. This bill now goes to conference.

Extension of the draft was declared imperative by all of our military leaders. I supported a continuation of the draft for another four years. This extension has passed both the Senate and the House.

It seems that almost everyone was on the bandwagon for Hawaiian Statehood, but I opposed admitting Hawaii as a State for many reasons-- its location more than 2000 miles from the American continent, a population which is more than 75 percent Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, and Polynesian, and which has traditions and culture very different from those of the people in our other States. The glamour of Hawaii was too much, however, and Statehood is assured for these Pacific islands.

The Area Redevelopment Bill, which would authorize government bureaucrats to subsidize industry/to locate in areas which have been found unprofitable by the leaders of industry, passed the Senate by a narrow margin. This is a 389 million dollar program which will not benefit the South in any way. In fact it will help other sections of the nation/to court industry away from locating in the South, with the aid of Federal subsidies. There are many good reasons why the President should veto this measure/if it is passed by the House, among which are: First, it would provide Government subsidies to industries/if they agree to move into areas which have already been found unsuitable by industry, itself; Second, it would permit untrained government bureaucrats to determine those locations/where industry might locate with the aid of subsidies; Third, the measure discriminates, not only between States with unemployment problems, but also between Towns and Counties within such States; Fourth, it would create another agency, which would have duties which duplicate those of several agencies already in existence, and there are too many

agencies now; Fifth, this new agency would be permanent in nature, and would grow and strengthen its position -- all at the expense of the taxpayer. In summation, this Area Redevelopment Bill represents one of the longest strides toward State socialism/ever considered by the Congress.

From this brief summary of the legislative efforts of the Congress/in the first three months of 1959, it is obvious that the Congress is leaning far to the left. The most alarming feature/is the apparent unconcern for the fiscal condition of the Federal Government. With the biggest peacetime deficit in our history last year, we appear to be resolutely striding down the road to bankruptcy. There are those in Congress, and so-called economists also, who maintain that there is nothing to be feared from deficit spending. Apparently these people who are so complacent to the dangers of deficit spending/have somehow escaped the bite of inflation which stalks the land, robbing everyone, but especially the fixed income groups such as retirees, annuitants and others. Neither do they seem to comprehend the seriousness/of the excessive tax burden/which the American people are caused to bear.

More than inflation is resulting from the ever increasing demand/ for big spending. In January, \$9.1 billion in Government obligations matured. Normally only about 10 percent of the maturities/meet with refusals to renew the obligations of the Government. Of the maturities which occurred in January, however, the refusals were up to 22 percent, despite the fact that renewals would have paid one and one-half to two percent more interest/than the matured obligations. As a result, the Treasury had to issue eight month tax-anticipation notes for \$1.5 billion/because there was no market for long term obligations. During this year/a total of \$42 billion in Government obligations fall due, without additions for any deficit spending this year. It is obvious that as far as borrowing is concerned, we are nearing the end of our rope. The answer is to reduce spending.

There is one item for which spending cannot be reduced, and in fact should be increased, and that is national defense. This is all the more reason we should economize/on non-defense programs. This brings us to the matters which will face Congress in the remaining days of this session.

The level of national defense which we should maintain, and the items on which we should concentrate our efforts, presents one of the most perplexing questions we have to face. The perplexity of this question is magnified/because of the consciousness/of the very life and death struggle/for the survival of the free world/which hangs on the outcome of our decisions. After listening to and studying the testimony of defense experts, I have concluded that the Administration's appropriation requests for defense/are adequate, but only provide for the bare minimum. Since our very existence depends on an adequate defense, we must provide more than a bare minimum -- in other words provide for a margin of safety. It is my belief/that we should increase the budgetary requests for such items/as Inter-continental Ballistic Missile development, including Minuteman, Titan and the Polaris system; for a Strategic Air Command Air Alert, for which the increased cost will not be prohibitive; for development of defensive missiles, such as Nike Zeus; and for insuring sufficient and modernly equipped ground forces/with which to meet aggression of limited objectives, commonly referred to as brush-fire wars.

Besides the defense issue, there are a number of other major questions/with which Congress will have to deal in the coming days, one way or the other. For instance, there is now pending in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare/a number of bills providing for aid to education. Among them are proposals for gigantic Federal grants/for school construction and teachers salaries. Should these proposals be enacted, the Federal Government will gain complete control/of all schools.

There is also the annual question of foreign aid. The Administration has requested a total appropriation of \$3.9 billion for this year. Surprisingly, there is, in some quarters, a strong desire to increase this amount. The Speaker of the House has stated that there will be no reduction, although we may yet prove him wrong.

Most of you are aware, I am sure, that so-called civil rights proposals are again being pushed in Congress. The bills introduced this year are, needless to say, even more extremist for the most part, than the versions in earlier years. Hearings on these proposals have already begun, and I desperately hope that this is as far as they will get. Nevertheless, we must be prepared to fight at every stage of consideration.

The worst of the lot is S. 810, introduced by Senator Douglas and 16 other civil rightSagitators. This is truly/a "conquered province" bill.

It would authorize the Attorney General/to seek and obtain injunctions in Federal court/against people who criticize court integration orders/or decisions.

It would authorize the Attorney General/to bring or intervene in every imaginable type of lawsuit.

It would offer Federal funds as bribes to communities/which would integrate schools.

It would cut off all Federal funds from schools/in Federally impacted areas which refuse to integrate.

It would authorize the Attorney General/to force "desegregation plans" on local communities/with court injunctions.

In summary, it seeks to return the South to the lowest pitch of subjection/which it underwent in Reconstruction.

This is not the only proposal on the subject, however, although it is the most extreme. The Administration has offered a number of bills, the most obnoxious of which/is an even stronger version of the Douglas provision/dealing with criticism of court integration decisions. The criticisms which the Douglas bill would prevent and punish with injunctions, the Administration's bill would make a criminal offense, punishable by fines of \$10,000/or imprisonment for not to exceed two years, or both.

The Administration bills also provide for use of Federal funds/to entice communities to integrate their schools; provide for subpoena power over voting records for the Attorney General; provide for the suspension of Federal funds to impacted areas which refuse to integrate; and provide for the establishment of Federal schools for children of members of the armed forces/in areas where the communities close schools rather than integrate them.

The bill introduced by Senator Johnson of Texas, S. 955, would, among other things, extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission, but for less time than the Administration proposes; give the Attorney General subpoena power over voting records; and create a so-called "conciliation service" to mediate race disputes/in the same manner that the Government now mediates labor disputes.

There are three different methods proposed for giving the Federal Bureau of Investigation/jurisdiction in "bombing" cases. The strongest bill, introduced by Senators Kennedy and Ervin, would give the FBI jurisdiction in any bombing of a church or school, based on an assumption that any explosive that might be used/had been shipped in interstate commerce. As a matter of fact, there is no constitutional ground for Federal jurisdiction in this field, and even if there were, there would be no more reason to grant Federal jurisdiction in this instance/than there would be in the case of any other crime. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover is opposed to the granting of such jurisdiction/because it would remove the responsibility for law enforcement in this field from the local level/where it belongs and where it can be most effectively carried out.

The Administration would give jurisdiction to the FBI/of any case of interstate flight/to avoid prosecution for bombing of a church or school. The Johnson bill would make it a Federal crime/to transport explosives across State lines/with the knowledge that the explosives were ultimately to be used for bombing a church or school.

Bombings are deplorable, but these bills are a good example of straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. If the Federal Government is interested in stopping bombings, why not take a closer look at the unmentionable bombings that accompany labor disturbances, and which outnumber by far bombings of churches and schools.

It is encouraging/that a substantial number of the members of the Civil Rights Commission/have indicated their intention/not to continue to serve on the Commission, even if it be continued. I sincerely hope that when these members testify before committees of Congress/that they will discourage the enactment of any further legislation in this field.

There remains one other important issue/which I would like to discuss with you. This is the matter of the labor reform bill/which will be considered by the Senate beginning sometime this month.

The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has reported a Labor Reform Bill/which may be aptly described as having rubber teeth. It is imperative that this bill be strengthened/by amendments from the floor of the Senate.

The big labor leaders are supporting the bill/which the Committee

has reported. It is common knowledge/that they agreed to support this so-called reform package/because it contains something they like—weakening amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act. As a matter of fact, they are supporting something very much to their liking/because the "reform" part of the bill is riddled with loopholes, and, therefore, they would be getting the Taft-Hartley Act weakened/without any effective legislative curb on the abuses/which should be abated.

Senator McClellan, who has spent so much time studying this matter, introduced a bill which would have been most effective/in dealing with the abuses which have been turned up by the McClellan Investigating Committee. His approach was rejected by the Committee, but Senator McClellan has publicly announced his intention/of offering amendments to the Committee bill on the floor of the Senate.

Other amendments will also be offered/in an effort to strengthen the bill.

One thing should be made crystal clear/at this point. Contrary to much of the propaganda on the subject, this legislation does not involve a controversy of "labor against management"; it presents an issue of whether or not/Congress is going to take effective action/to prevent exploitation of workers and the public/by unscrupulous labor leaders.

In the latter part of the nineteenth century/and the early part of the twentieth century, business barons captured control of economic and political power of the country. With this power/they succeeded in exploiting working people and the public in general. This abusive situation was corrected by Congress after a long struggle/by passage of anti-trust laws and such acts as the Corrupt Practices Act, and by the efforts of organized labor. Of what difference is it to the working man/and to the public/that those by whom they are exploited/are wealthy labor bosses/rather than wealthy business barons? No one group, or combination of groups, regardless of their identity or association, must be permitted to serve themselves at the expense of the average citizen. Just as there were only a minority of businessmen/whose actions made necessary the passage of anti-trust laws and the Corrupt Practices Act, there is only

a minority of labor leaders/whose actions necessitate an effective labor reform bill at this time. Similarly, just as the anti-trust laws did not keep business from operating successfully, an effective labor reform bill will not prevent organized labor/from accomplishing the legitimate purposes of collective bargaining.

It has come to my attention/that at a meeting of the South Carolina Labor Council in Charleston on March 26, Joseph D. Keenan, general secretary and treasurer of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, ^{of Washington, D.C.} and Sinway Young, Chairman of the South Carolina Labor Council, called for my defeat next year. Their attacks come as no surprise to me, and even less surprising/is the timing of their attacks/just before the Senate considers the Labor Reform Bill.

It is the current practice of the International labor union leaders/to lobby in Congress/for almost all of the more radical proposals. In his attack, Mr. Keenan mentioned such issues as public housing, slum clearance, urban renewal, and other expensive socialistic programs/in which the Federal Government has no jurisdiction/and further has no financial ability to participate. I have vigorously opposed such programs, for with each of them the individual's rights diminish materially, and take-home pay for all taxpayers goes down. Is the lot of the average working man any better/if he gets increased pay, if at the same time taxes go up and inflation takes a bigger bite? Most important to the average citizen is his purchasing power, regardless of its "dollar" measurement.

Mr. Keenan stated correctly/that I am in favor of the States having the power to enact right-to-work laws, for I have made no secret of the fact/that I believe a working man/should have the right to either join or not to join/a union, as he prefers, without any compulsion. It is quite obvious that the union movement has not been damaged/by right-to-work laws; certainly the working man has been benefitted by them, since under their operation/the union must necessarily be more responsive to members' wishes/in order to hold its membership. Among the factors which have been damaging to ~~the~~ union efforts at organization/are the expenditure by labor bosses of union dues for purposes to which workers are opposed, such as integration of the races; racketeering; exploitation of the workers and the public by unscrupulous union heads; and--most important--the refusal of labor leaders/to put the real interest of the working man/before their own selfish interests.

Despite the avowed reasons for their animosity, however,

I suspect that the distaste which the union bosses indicate for me goes somewhat deeper. Last year when the Senate considered the labor reform matter, I pointed out to both the Senate and South Carolinians that the National and International labor unions were using members' dues for purposes other than collective bargaining and to which purposes the dues paying members were opposed. In particular, I pointed out that many International union treasuries were contributing heavily to advance integration. I cannot believe that any substantial number of union members in South Carolina are willingly contributing to such efforts. I, therefore, supported vigorously an amendment which would make union leaders accountable in court to dues paying union members for the expending of union dues. It is still my belief that union members everywhere should be able to prevent their dues from being spent for purposes other than collective bargaining and to which they are opposed, and I will attempt again this year to give the union member the right to call his officers to an accounting for these funds.

There can be no doubt that the labor leaders' efforts to organize the workers of the South have been impeded by the unions' stand and activities with respect to the segregation question. For instance, only last year the Electrical workers sought to have the National Labor Relations Board declare that the ^{employers'} publication of this union's efforts for integration of the races to be an unfair labor practice. The NLRB held that ^{since} the publications ^{of the unions' pro-integration stand} were true, and that such did not constitute an unfair labor practice. Certainly the worker who is contemplating voting for a particular union to represent him at the bargaining table has the right to know whether his union dues will be used against his will to promote the mixing of the races and other alien ideologies.

If by the timing of this attack, Mr. Keenan and Mr. Young intended to influence my actions on the Labor Reform Bill in the Senate, they will be sadly disappointed. It is my intention to fight vigorously to insure the adoption of amendments to the bill which will give the worker effective control of his own organization and of his dues, and at the same time to insure the end of exploitations of workers and the public by unscrupulous union bosses.

In closing, let me reaffirm to you my pledge to continue to fight

vigorously/for a return to Constitutional and fiscally sound programs,
and to preserve the inalienable rights of individuals/which can best
be protected by fostering States rights; and to oppose/just as
vigorously/those socialistic influences which seek to destroy the
South/and ultimately, America itself.

END